



COUNCIL MINUTES

October 8, 2009

The City Council of the City of Mesa met in a Study Session in the lower level meeting room of the Council Chambers, 57 East 1st Street, on October 8, 2009 at 7:31 a.m.

COUNCIL PRESENT

Mayor Scott Smith
Alex Finter
Dina Higgins
Kyle Jones
Dennis Kavanaugh
Dave Richins
Scott Somers

COUNCIL ABSENT

None

OFFICERS PRESENT

Christopher Brady
Debbie Spinner
Linda Crocker

Mayor Smith excused Councilmember Richins from the beginning of the meeting. He arrived at 7:32 a.m.

1. Hear a presentation, discuss and provide direction on the Mesa-Falcon Field Airport Master Plan Update.

Falcon Field Airport Director Corinne Nystrom introduced Jim Harris and Matt Quick, representatives of Coffman Associates, the consulting firm hired by the City to prepare the Master Plan Update. Ms. Nystrom displayed a PowerPoint presentation (**see Attachment 1**) to provide an overview of the Master Plan Update.

Ms. Nystrom stated that the Airport Master Plan is a proactive document that identifies and plans for the future needs of the airport while being sensitive to the needs of the surrounding area. She outlined the purpose of the Master Plan (see Page 3 of Attachment 1), and she advised that the completed Plan will be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for their approval. Ms. Nystrom also outlined areas that are not included in a Master Plan (see Page 4 of Attachment 1).

Ms. Nystrom noted that Falcon Field's importance to the community relates to the fact that the airport serves as a major business and employment center, an amenity for recreational aircraft users, and a general aviation reliever for Sky Harbor International and Phoenix-Mesa Gateway airports. She reported that the airport's economic impact in 2007 was \$2.33 billion. Ms. Nystrom added that 84 businesses "on-airport" provide 1,233 jobs and that "off-airport" employment represents 13,249 jobs.

In response to questions from Councilmember Higgins, Ms. Nystrom said she would provide a copy of the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) report that detailed the airport's economic impact, and she clarified that many of the 13,249 "off-airport" jobs are unrelated to the airport.

Ms. Nystrom stated that the vision for Falcon Field is that of an economic nucleus in and around which businesses that create more jobs would be concentrated.

Mr. Harris continued the presentation by noting that the Master Plan process, which included substantial public input, was consistent with the requirements of the FAA and the ADOT Aeronautics Group. He advised that a Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) was formed in 2007 that consisted of 17 stakeholders to ensure public involvement. Mr. Harris reported that in addition to holding public meetings, information was made available on the website. He explained that the demand-based forecast assumes that the airport will continue as a general aviation reliever and continue to serve general aviation and corporate aviation tenants. Mr. Harris outlined the forecast assumptions (see Page 10 of Attachment 1) utilized in preparing the Plan, and he added that the Master Plan can be adjusted to reflect future changes.

In response to a question from Councilmember Richins, Mr. Harris advised that a "general aviation reliever" is an airport designated to relieve general aviation traffic (smaller aircraft) from a major airport or a hub airport that primarily serves larger, commercial aircraft. He added that a "general aviation" airport such as Falcon Field primarily serves privately-owned and corporate aircraft and that the Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport serves commercial traffic and is often referenced as a passenger reliever airport for Sky Harbor. Mr. Harris referred to the "Forecast Summary" (see Page 11 of Attachment 1) and stated that the forecast scenarios were prepared in accordance with FAA forecasting guidelines.

Responding to a question from Councilmember Higgins, Mr. Harris said that the forecast is based on the projected growth of the population base in the Falcon Field service area, which is defined as a thirty-minute drive time in the area surrounding the airport. He stated that additional hangars and apron areas would be required to accommodate the projected 2027 demand. Mr. Harris advised that Mr. Quick would continue the presentation.

Mr. Quick said that the Master Plan identifies the development potential for Falcon Field Airport and describes the ultimate build out from the airside and the landside perspectives. He explained that "airside" refers to runways, the taxiway system, the navigational aids, airfield lighting and markings; "landside" considerations include infrastructure, buildings, aircraft storage hangars, parking spaces, roadways and support facilities. Mr. Quick noted that the Master Plan process began two years ago prior to the current economic downturn, which may cause development to occur more slowly. He advised that a key objective is to improve efficiency while maintaining safety and design standards. Mr. Quick outlined projects and the costs for the short, intermediate and long term timeframes (see Pages 15, 16 and 17 of Attachment 1).

Mayor Smith clarified that the source of the "local share" amounts identified on Pages 15, 16, and 17 of Attachment 1 is airport revenues and that there is no impact on the City's General Fund.

Mr. Quick advised that the Plan also recommends the implementation of an Automated Surface Observation System (ASOS), a weather-related system that is beneficial to pilots. Mr. Quick

said that other recommendations include drainage improvements to the north runway area and relocating the north taxiway approximately 240 feet north of the runway in order to accommodate the type of aircraft usage anticipated in the future. Addressing the landside development, Mr. Quick advised that one of the main items is renovating the World War II hangar located southwest of the existing terminal building to serve as the terminal building. He said that private entities would be responsible for most of the landside development, and he added that Falcon Field Park would be retained in its current state. Mr. Quick noted that 59 acres west of Greenfield Road are targeted for non-aviation industrial development, which should enhance airport revenues.

Mr. Harris continued the presentation by advising that although the the Master Plan Update is not a noise abatement or mitigation study, the report does address twenty environmental issues identified by the FAA as areas of concern, one of which is airport noise. He advised that noise contours identify the existing aircraft noise exposure (see Page 18 of Attachment 1) and the long range aircraft noise exposure (see Page 19 of Attachment 1).

In response to a question from Councilmember Somers, Mr. Harris stated that the contours attempt to replicate the activity at Falcon Field (the patterns of takeoffs and landings on which runways and the types of aircraft) and the long range contours reflect increased operations and newer aircraft. He advised that the modeling utilizes FAA data based on testing for specific aircraft.

Discussion ensued regarding the fact that data displayed at the Arizona State University Decision Theater for the Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport is a different type of data than what is included in the Falcon Field Master Plan Update.

City Manager Christopher Brady stated that the Decision Theater data for the Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport was designed to provide specific information for the Council and staff and was not collected in accordance with FAA guidelines.

Mayor Smith cautioned that the Decision Theater data measured only two or three planes to provide an example for land use purposes and the data is not comparable with the noise exposure maps for Falcon Field. He noted that the Gateway's air space and departure procedures were altered in 2007 in response to flight pattern changes at Sky Harbor International Airport. He stated that there have been no significant changes in air space at Falcon Field.

Mr. Harris explained that obtaining data for the FAA Part 150 Study is a very complex procedure that includes obtaining detailed radar tracks of planes for a given year and collecting data on the type of aircraft and the types of engines in the aircraft. He added that field measurements are used only for validation purposes.

Mr. Harris referred to the Public Airport Disclosure Map (see Page 20 of Attachment 1), which is required by State Statutes and he advised that the map is intended to inform the public that residents in that area will see and potentially hear aircraft.

In response to a question from Mayor Smith as to why the disclosure area is not a complete rectangle, Mr. Harris explained that the area is specifically defined by the FAA to reflect the fact that most training operations occur to the north.

Mayor Smith suggested that the map be expanded to fill in the corners as a conservative approach to reflect what may actually be occurring with regard to training flights.

Mr. Harris stated that the Council could decide to change the map to reflect their judgment that training is occurring in both the north and the south areas.

Mayor Smith stated that based on his experience as a pilot who flies out of Falcon Field he believes an expanded version of the map would be more accurate. He said that he would rather err on the side of being conservative.

Responding to questions from Councilmember Richins, Mr. Harris said that when the map is recorded with the County the map becomes part of the public disclosure process to the buyer of a property at closing. He added that he was not knowledgeable regarding any requirement for the realtor to make copies of the map available.

Councilmember Higgins noted that she was required to sign a statement regarding an aviation easement when purchasing property.

City Attorney Debbie Spinner advised that the requirement to provide a map could be included as a stipulation of a zoning case for new construction, and she would investigate the manner in which the City could require that a map be provided to the purchaser of an existing home.

Mr. Brady noted that his understanding is that the Council prefers to square off the corners of the map in the interest of full disclosure.

Ms. Nystrom summarized that the airport will continue to grow and will focus on infill development. She noted that in response to concerns expressed at an earlier meeting, the Falcon Field Park will remain intact. She added that the needs of the community must be balanced with the needs of the airport.

Responding to comments from Councilmember Higgins, Mr. Brady explained that the City hopes to continue to expand airport operations, which he noted is the direction given to staff in the past.

Mayor Smith said that airports create economic development opportunities which benefit the entire City.

Mr. Brady noted that noise generated by training activities appears to be the most troublesome issue for area residents.

Mayor Smith stated the opinion that the focus at the airport should be on quality and the types of activities that will foster coexistence between the neighbors, businesses and the airport.

Mr. Harris explained that although the Master Plan Update proposes to expand airport operations, the Plan does not propose to extend the boundaries of the airport or the length of the runways.

Mayor Smith noted that an advantage of having two airports in the City is that aircraft requiring a longer runway can utilize the Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.

Ms. Nystrom expressed the opinion that the Falcon Field Master Plan complements the direction of the Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport. She added that both airports have to work together regarding future plans.

Mr. Brady said that the proposal incorporates the recommendations of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and he noted that staff would like to place this item on a future Council agenda.

Mayor Smith suggested that the Council study the material so that any additional significant issues can be addressed at a Study Session prior to placing the item on the Council agenda in November.

Mayor Smith thanked Ms. Nystrom, Mr. Harris, and Mr. Quick for the presentation.

2. Hear a presentation, discuss and provide direction on the following proposals:

- a. Consolidating the Downtown Development Committee and the Planning and Zoning Board.

Development and Sustainability Department Director Christine Zielonka displayed a PowerPoint presentation (**see Attachment 2**) and advised that following a Council discussion in June, staff met with the advisory boards in July to review the possibility of consolidating the Downtown Development Committee (DDC) and Planning and Zoning (P&Z) and modifying the responsibilities of the Design Review Board (DRB).

Planning Director John Wesley reported that the DDC expressed concern that the focus on downtown and the vision for the area would be lost along with the one application process. He said that the DDC acknowledged the value of streamlining the processes and that the P&Z Board recognized the benefits of integrating the planning functions. He noted that the P&Z Boardmembers also expressed concern regarding the special needs and issues related to the downtown area that should receive prompt attention. Mr. Wesley summarized the issues (see Page 5 of Attachment 2), and he further advised that staff recommends consolidation of the DDC and P&Z Boards.

In response to a request from City Manager Christopher Brady, Mr. Wesley explained that Planning Department staff would have the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the downtown area during the planning of the extension of the light rail corridor to Gilbert Road.

Councilmember Kavanaugh commented that he had reservations regarding the proposal. He learned at a recent conference that the trend for most cities is to move towards the specialized approach to downtown areas. He noted that Mesa has been recognized as a successful example of the concept, and he expressed concern that the City was moving away from a model that other communities consider to be the gold standard. Councilmember Kavanaugh suggested that Council consideration of the Village Concept could address some of his concerns.

Councilmember Higgins concurred with the comments of Councilmember Kavanaugh, and she expressed support for maintaining the DDC as a separate committee.

Councilmember Somers advised that Arizona State University is engaging with local communities regarding the planning function. He noted that the City of Phoenix is abandoning the Village Concept because a sense of community was lacking in the planning areas. He stated the opinion that the process adopted should reflect the community, and he added that a sense of community does exist in various areas of Mesa, such as the Lehi area, the Citrus subarea and the Gateway area. Councilmember Somers said that the 2010 General Plan Update provides an opportunity to address these types of issues. He further stated the opinion that the immediate focus should be on the Zoning Code and General Plan Updates, after which the processes could be considered.

Councilmember Finter stated the opinion that the personnel reductions to the Planning Department have eliminated the support for the current process. He favored consolidation of the committees, and he added that his goal would be to streamline the process and include maximum public input.

Vice Mayor Jones noted that the proposal to consolidate is driven by a lack of staff. He expressed a preference for a more streamlined operation with a consolidated process that is able to facilitate the form-based code.

Councilmember Richins said that the current citizen participation plan has some deficiencies. He expressed support for the consolidated approach, and he stated the opinion that Mesa has subareas that would be conducive to implementing the Village Concept.

Mayor Smith said that the light rail transit corridor study area, which extends from the Sycamore Station to Gilbert Road, is actually a transportation corridor study. He noted that presently two different procedures exist in the corridor: one between Country Club and Mesa Drives and another procedure in the remaining area. He said that maintaining the current system would prohibit the City from taking advantage of many new processes that have been implemented, such as form-based codes. Mayor Smith stated the opinion that a land use and a design standard approach developed for the Mesa Proving Grounds should apply Citywide, but may require unique applications for certain areas such as the downtown area. He expressed support for consolidating the boards, and he added that public input would continue to be an important component. Mayor Smith said that the DDC presently supplants the regulatory duties of the P&Z Board. He further stated the opinion that the color-coded map of downtown Mesa limits opportunities rather than expanding opportunities, and he expressed support for creating a single City-wide regulatory framework.

Councilmember Richins noted that he would support staff's recommendation which also includes additional emphasis on citizen involvement and moves forward to implementing the Village Concept.

It was moved by Councilmember Richins, seconded by Vice Mayor Jones, to direct staff to move forward with the recommendation to consolidate the P&Z Board and the DDC.

Councilmember Finter noted that staffing levels have been insufficient in recent years to address subarea plans.

Mr. Brady suggested that staff provide a future update to the Council on the existing subarea plans and how the community could be engaged in the process.

Mayor Smith noted that subarea plans would be a part of the discussion of the Design Review Board.

Councilmember Somers expressed concern that the Council is taking a piecemeal approach to the process. He stated the opinion that the downtown area requires focused attention.

Mayor Smith suggested that staff should identify for the Council those areas where resources are lacking that impact the achievement of goals.

Councilmember Richins stated the opinion that the Council is taking a strategic approach rather than a piecemeal approach.

Councilmember Higgins stated the opinion that making a change to move away from what is considered to be the "best practice" for communities at a time when many other changes are being implemented does not seem to be appropriate.

Vice Mayor Jones expressed the opinion that having a consistent City-wide process that is able to recognize unique areas within the City is important.

In response to the comments made by Councilmember Higgins regarding the timing of the proposal, Mayor Smith expressed the belief that this is the opportune time for Mesa to move forward on the issue.

Mayor Smith called for the vote.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES –	Finter-Jones-Richins-Smith
NAYS –	Higgins-Kavanaugh-Somers
ABSENT –	None

Mayor Smith declared the motion carried by a majority vote.

b. Modifying the responsibilities, authorities and duties of the Design Review Board.

Planning Director John Wesley continued the PowerPoint presentation (see Attachment 2) and addressed the proposed modification to the Design Review Board (DRB) that would change the process to have the DRB serve as an appeals board to staff's decisions. He noted that the DDC made few comments regarding the proposal. Mr. Wesley reviewed the comments of the P&Z Boardmembers (see Page 7 of Attachment 2) and the comments of the DRB (see Page 8 of Attachment 2), and he summarized the proposed modifications to the DRB (see Page 9 of Attachment 2). He noted that monthly meetings of the DRB could provide an opportunity for their input on design guidelines after which staff would implement the recommendations.

Mayor Smith congratulated staff for effectively addressing and streamlining a complex concept. He clarified that the earlier Council vote was only intended to provide direction to staff. He added that formal Council action at a Regular Council meeting would be required to implement the recommendation.

Mayor Smith advised that a citizen requested the opportunity to address the Council regarding agenda item 2.

Robert Burgheimer of Form 5 Architecture Studio Inc., a former member of the DRB, expressed opposition to the proposed changes to the Board. He said that the Board performs an objective review of projects, and he stated the opinion that staff could be subjected to political pressure. He suggested that stronger design guidelines are required, and he noted that the citizens attending the meetings usually want to address the Board regarding land use issues rather than design issues.

Vice Mayor Jones said he has followed the activity of the DRB, and he stated the opinion that some cases were delayed for vague reasons or a Boardmember's personal views. He expressed support for the recommendation to accelerate the process by having staff implement the recommendations of the DRB. He added that the purpose of the DRB is to ensure that development is consistent with the neighborhood.

Councilmember Kavanaugh thanked staff for their efforts, and he stated the opinion that the proposal has moved beyond the issues discussed by the Council several months ago. He expressed concurrence with many of the comments made by Mr. Burgheimer, and he noted that the requirement for the DRB was placed in the City Charter as the result of a citizen initiative.

Councilmember Somers said he also agreed with the comments of Mr. Burgheimer. He stated the opinion that the processes should be streamlined and implemented based on the new Codes.

Mayor Smith thanked Mr. Burgheimer for his input. He stated the opinion that the adopted processes should reflect the City's new vision and that the end result should be a DRB that has a new mission to establish guidelines that "raise the bar" in the City, ensure adherence to the guidelines, and act as a monitor. He further stated the opinion that the current system falls short by failing to reward good design.

Councilmember Higgins expressed support for option 2b, which reads, "Maintain the current DRB function, do not retain the services of consulting architects..." She added that items discussed this morning such as the stronger and better guidelines should be incorporated.

Mr. Wesley advised that staff was planning to prepare the ordinance changes for Council consideration in December. He explained that a delay would be difficult because establishing the guidelines could be a multi-year process.

Councilmember Higgins said that she would prefer to maintain the DRB in its current form and gradually incorporate the guideline changes.

Councilmember Somers stated the opinion that the function of the DRB requires some modifications, and he said he concurred with the comments made by Vice Mayor Jones in that some responsibilities should be shifted to City staff.

City Manager Christopher Brady restated the modified recommendation that the DRB would remain intact, continue to meet on a monthly basis, and continue to conduct work sessions, which have proven to be very successful. He added that the DRB would also work with staff on the subarea plans. Mr. Brady said that the improvements to the process provide for staff to work with the applicant to implement the recommendations of the DRB, and the case would return to DRB only if staff and the applicant are unable to agree on the implementation process. He added that the DRB would have the opportunity to review cases to ensure that their recommendations were implemented. Mr. Brady said that this was the proposal before the Council, which was also reviewed by DRB at last night's meeting.

Mayor Smith stated that staff and the DRB can determine when certain cases are to be handled by staff and need not return to the DRB.

Councilmember Richins noted that the recommendation eliminates the one-month delay for cases that would normally appear on the next consent agenda.

Mayor Smith said that the DRB does take an active role in reviewing projects and the DRB has the discretion to refer a case to staff with direction.

Councilmember Richins said that staff has the option to return a case to the DRB when staff and the applicant are unable to agree. He noted that this represents a "quasi appeals" process.

Mr. Wesley confirmed that staff is recommending this process.

In response to comments from Councilmember Higgins, Development and Sustainability Department Director Christine Zielonka read the following paragraph from page 5 of the Council Report, which is Option c:

"One option suggested was for the DRB to continue with the work sessions and then let staff finalize the review and make the approval unless there was an issue that staff and the applicant could not come to agreement on. This suggestion might address all of the concerns by keeping the Board involved, but allow for faster completion of the review process by not having to wait for a subsequent Board meeting. This option will be discussed with the DRB at their Oct. 7, 2009 meeting and a summary of that discussion will be presented to Council at the Study Session on Oct. 8."

Ms. Zielonka stated that this proposal is a hybrid version of the earlier proposal.

Mr. Wesley noted that work sessions are posted as public meetings and members of the public are welcome to attend and speak at these sessions.

It was moved by Councilmember Richins, seconded by Councilmember Somers, that staff be directed to move forward with Option c.

Mayor Smith asked if anyone was opposed.

Councilmember Higgins said she was opposed to the motion, but could support the option when it is presented in the future with more concise language.

Mayor Smith noted that the remaining majority are in support of the motion. He declared the motion carried, and he directed staff to move forward with Option c.

Mayor Smith announced that the Council would take a short break at 9:44 a.m. He reconvened the Study Session at 9:52 a.m. with all members present except Councilmember Richins, who returned to the meeting at 10:04 a.m.

3. Hear a presentation, discuss and provide direction on revising the massage establishment ordinance.

Police Staff Attorney Nancy Sorensen introduced Acting Assistant Chief Steve Stahl and Lieutenant Lee White, who were present to address the Council regarding revisions to the massage establishment ordinance.

Chief Stahl reported that the Public Safety Committee requested that the Police Department review the current massage establishment ordinance to determine its effectiveness and to identify changes that would make Mesa's ordinance comparable to the ordinances in other Valley cities. He said that Ms. Sorensen has compiled information, and he added that meetings were held with City stakeholders and the Arizona State Board for Massage Therapy at which copies of the proposed changes were provided for their review.

Ms. Sorensen displayed a PowerPoint presentation (**see Attachment 3**) and advised that Mesa presently has approximately 120 massage establishments, which are investigated by the Police Department in two ways, administratively and criminally. She said that the Police Department is requesting regulatory tools to enhance their ability to enforce the law and eradicate illegal activity. Ms. Sorensen advised that the proposal would change Mesa's ordinance to be similar to that of the City of Phoenix.

Ms. Sorensen said that the Police Department has identified additional controls in the licensing process, such as a more extensive background check and fingerprinting requirements. She outlined many of the proposed changes (see Pages 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 of Attachment 3), some of which are requiring business owners to submit drawings of the premises, requiring photo identification and names of the employees; listing the name of each manager along with their photo, provide a copy of the floor plan, maintaining a customer log for each therapist, implementing business hour restrictions, requiring the City's permission to change locations, posting the name and photograph of each employee inside the establishment, posting the manager's permit, and notifying the City of any changes.

Councilmember Higgins clarified that the State of Arizona license for each therapist which includes their photo should be posted in a prominent location similar to the requirement for cosmetologists and barbers.

Ms. Sorensen said that the requirement to post the license is included in the draft ordinance. She reported that staff met with the massage community, including therapists and business

owners, to hear their concerns and that issues discussed during the meetings would be addressed in the document. Ms. Sorensen advised that staff was seeking Council direction to move forward to revise the massage establishment ordinance.

Councilmember Kavanaugh thanked staff for their efforts, and he acknowledged Councilmember Higgins' efforts to maintain a focus on this issue during the past year. He noted that a number of establishments in Mesa were operating in an unlawful manner, and he expressed support for staff's recommendation to approach the issue from a business and regulatory perspective. Councilmember Kavanaugh said that the proposed changes would make Mesa's regulations more consistent with those of other Valley cities, and he expressed support for the Council providing staff with direction to move forward with the revisions.

Councilmember Finter said he would appreciate staff making an effort to maintain an open, proactive dialogue with legitimate business owners regarding the revised regulations.

Vice Mayor Jones noted that lobbyists for legitimate massage businesses are often present at National League of Cities events urging local governments to enact regulations that would eliminate the illegal operations.

Mayor Smith stated that although he generally favors less government regulation of businesses, the situation in Mesa with regard to massage establishments is out of balance. He commended Councilmembers Kavanaugh and Higgins for their leadership on this issue.

In response to a question from Mayor Smith, City Attorney Debbie Spinner advised that the new regulations would apply to existing and new businesses.

Discussion ensued relative to the fact that the State licenses therapists; that the City licenses businesses, which includes a background check of the owner; and that many of the proposed requirements are very similar to the requirements that presently exist for barbershops and beauty salons.

Mayor Smith noted that the consensus of the Council was to move forward to draft the ordinance.

Commander Stahl explained that the revisions would be presented to the stakeholders and reviewed by the City Attorney's Office prior to Council consideration of the ordinance.

Responding to a question from Mayor Smith, Lieutenant White stated the opinion that all three areas are important: the administrative inspections, the criminal investigations, and the revision of the ordinance, which enables Mesa to be more consistent with other Valley cities. He said that some short-term successes have occurred because of the department's recent emphasis on these types of establishments.

Mayor Smith commented that the proposed changes should enable the Police Department to more effectively address the issue without expending a large amount of resources.

Lieutenant White reported that inspections of the 120 massage businesses resulted in 43 citations for violations of the existing ordinance and 78 charges were filed against 63 individuals.

He said that 20 of the arrests were for prostitution and other arrests were for unlicensed individuals performing massages, businesses operating without a license, etc.

Mayor Smith said that staff has direction regarding the ordinance, and he thanked them for their efforts.

4. Hear reports on meetings and/or conferences attended.

Vice Mayor Jones: Light Rail Transit Stakeholder's Meeting
East Valley Senior Services 40th Anniversary Event

Councilmember Kavanaugh: Family Self-Sufficiency Graduation Ceremony

Councilmember Higgins: Boeing Company Fire Safety Awareness Event

5. Scheduling of meetings and general information.

Deputy City Manager Kari Kent stated that the meeting schedule is as follows:

Friday, October 9, 2009, 6:00 p.m. – October Fest in Downtown Mesa

Saturday, October 10, 2009, 8:00 a.m. – District 1 Pancake Breakfast at Fire Station #211

Saturday, October 10, 2009, 10:00 a.m. – MACFest

Thursday, October 15, 2009, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

Saturday, October 17, 2009, 8:00 a.m. – District 4 Pancake Breakfast at Fire Station #202

Monday, October 19, 2009, TBD – Study Session

Monday, October 19, 2009, 5:45 p.m. – Regular Council Meeting

6. Items from citizens present.

There were no items from citizens present.

7. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Study Session adjourned at 10:16 a.m.

SCOTT SMITH, MAYOR

ATTEST:

LINDA CROCKER, CITY CLERK

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Study Session of the City Council of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 8th day of October, 2009. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

LINDA CROCKER, CITY CLERK

baa

Attachments (3)